



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

This simple but as yet altogether efficient agreement, promulgated under the presidency of James Monroe, is representative of an international "doctrine" which it is to be hoped may be perpetual between the two nations which subscribed to it.

In referring to this subject, however, I desire more particularly to call attention to the fact that the waters of the Strait of Magellan have also, since the year 1881, been internationally known as neutral. In compliance with the request made to the Department of State, several years after the above date, for the exact wording of the stipulation entered into between Chile and the Argentine Confederation, I received the following transcription (in Spanish) of the text of Article V. of said treaty:

"El Estrecho de Magallanes queda neutralizado en perpetuidad y asegurada su libre navegacion para las banderas de todas las Naciones. En el interes de asegurar esta libertad no se construiren en las costas fortificaciones ni defensas militares que puedan contrariar ese proposito." (The Strait of Magellan to remain perpetually neutral, and its free navigation assured to the flags of all nations. With the intent of securing this immunity, it is forbidden to construct on the coasts thereof any fortifications or military defenses which would defeat such purpose.)

In connection with this notable treaty, it is proper to state that it was largely effected through the good offices of the United States Ministers (both bearing the name of Osborn) at the capitals of Chile and the Argentine Confederation. Not only was the neutralization of the Strait secured, but a permanent settlement was reached of the long-standing dispute between the two republics as to their respective rights of ownership in the territory theretofore called Patagonia. Obviously the Anglo-Saxon had a hand in establishing that condition of assured amity between the republics which lately led them to make sale of their useless battleships, and to formally set up an emblem of perpetual concord on their Andean boundary line.

JOSIAH W. LEEDS.

WESTCHESTER, PA., March 27, 1905.

What the United States Should Do to Promote a General Treaty of Obligatory Arbitration at the Next Hague Conference.

[Hon. Richard Bartholdt's view as given in an interview in the *New York Tribune*.]

The first fruit of the recent congress of the Interparliamentary Union was the action of President Roosevelt in calling the international conference for some early date at The Hague. The next material result was the negotiation of the arbitration agreements with England, Germany, France, Italy, Switzerland and Spain, but this was nullified by the action of the Senate. Of course, the attitude of the Senate was based on the belief that the treaty making right of that body under the constitution would be violated if the Executive could take the initiative in the adjustment of international differences. If they are right in that interpretation, it is certainly regrettable that the constitution presents an obstacle to the advancement of the cause of international arbitration. It is a fact, however, that the very senators who felt

called on to defend the constitution are earnest friends of arbitration.

I was greatly depressed by the action of the Senate, and for a time felt that we had been set back a hundred years in the work for the world's peace; but I have come to entertain a different view of the situation. On Saturday last, accompanied by Hayne Davis, I called on the President, with whom we had a full and free interchange of views. I then said to the President that the practical rejection of the treaties by their amendment might not be such a calamity after all, but rather a blessing in disguise. I called attention to the fact that the treaties that had been negotiated were modeled after the Anglo-French treaty, which, for obvious reasons, would be somewhat restricted in its scope. Only judicial questions and those differences growing out of earlier treaty provisions came within the limitations of the agreements which are now regarded by the President as belonging to the category of closed incidents. It will now be possible, however, to formulate a treaty that will enumerate a large number of specific subjects, on which the contracting powers will be willing, if differences arise, to refer them for adjustment to the Hague Tribunal—questions that will not invade the inhibited field of national honor or independence or vital interest.

The subjects can, of course, only be determined by careful study, and the list may be utilized in variable measure—in whole or in part, as the contracting parties could determine. The result would be greatly to broaden the scope of the arbitration agreement, and enlarge its usefulness. This idea appealed to the President.

It would be my thought that the early appointment of the American representatives to the Hague Conference would make it possible for them to compare notes and propose subjects that could properly be regarded as admissible of arbitration. They could take the public into their confidence through the press, and popular sentiment would help to mould and refine the distinctively American view. Other powers would by this means also become cognizant of our attitude in advance of the conference at The Hague. I believe this means of enhancing the practical usefulness of international arbitration will appeal to the various powers already committed to the peace propaganda. I believe also that sympathetic action in the Hague Conference would go far to assure the subsequent exchange of ratifications, and that the cause of arbitration would so be broadened and its vital force extended.

A Business Man's View of the Senate's Action on the Arbitration Treaties.

[Mr. Arthur B. Farquhar, of York, Pa., Vice-President of the National Association of Manufacturers, a well-known manufacturer and political economist, and a most active supporter of the international arbitration and peace movement, has sent us the following communication which was recently published in the *Philadelphia Public Ledger*. We are very glad to reproduce it for our readers, the more so as Mr. Farquhar has recently become a member of the American Peace Society.]

The final consummation of a treaty is something that requires considerable time, under our form of government, owing to the necessity of a vote of two-thirds of the Senate in its favor to give it validity. More for that